

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/057,451	RUEDIGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Elizabeth Quan	1743	

All Participants:

(1) Elizabeth Quan.

(2) Robert L. Epstein.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 4 March 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

N/A

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner notified Attorney that the after final submitted 1/26/2004 has finally been forwarded to the Examiner. Attorney indicated that it is not necessary to send an advisory action since it was decided in the interview of 2/4/2004 that the claims should be amended and the claims submitted with the Request for Reconsideration filed 2/11/2004 should supercede that of the claims submitted 1/26/2004 to the office and faxed to Examiner 2/2/2004 since the claims of 1/26/2004 has not been made available to the Examiner by processing personnel before the interview on 2/4/2004. Examiner did not realize that the fax of 2/2/2004 was a duplicate copy of the after final amendment submitted 1/26/2004. Examiner thought the fax fulfilled the sole purpose of discussion in the interview. Examiner indicated that she may need to send an advisory action to clarify the record. Attorney indicated that he will just file the advisory action in his records. .